



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

attempt of the Republicans to adapt their arguments to the laboring man, although that was the most marked feature of the contemporary anti-slavery campaign, and the above-mentioned speech by Schurz is its best exemplification. Nor is it that these speeches are left to tell their own story, for they are referred to (p. 186, etc.) and quoted (p. 182, etc.) on other subjects. There is no discussion of the results of the election except for the statement that Lincoln was elected. One is left to suppose that the election determined the Civil War and the line of division.

It seems scarcely courteous of Mr. Fite to state, as he does in his preface, that presidential campaigns "strangely enough . . . have hitherto been neglected as subjects for historical investigation". Mr. Rhodes's account of this period is three-quarters as long as Mr. Fite's and is a history of the campaign. Mr. Rhodes's account doubtless needs supplementing and review along several lines, and one of these is that of popular discussion. It is this niche which Mr. Fite's book might be supposed to cover, but it is not a history of the campaign, and it is not sufficiently ripe.

CARL RUSSELL FISH.

Diary of Gideon Welles, Secretary of the Navy under Lincoln and Johnson. With an Introduction by JOHN T. MORSE, jr. In three volumes. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1911. Pp. liii, 549; xvi, 653; xv, 670.)

FOR many years the existence of this Diary in manuscript has been well known. It afforded the basis for upwards of twenty articles—mostly on affairs under Lincoln—which Mr. Welles contributed to the *Galaxy* or the *Atlantic Monthly* from time to time between July, 1870, and April, 1878. Mr. Nicolay was permitted to see the Diary and to make a few extracts from the manuscript while he and Mr. Hay were preparing their elaborate study of Lincoln's career. But Mr. Nicolay was obliged to consult the Diary in Hartford under some restrictions. Almost thirty-two years after Mr. Welles's death, portions of the Diary began to appear in the *Atlantic Monthly* of November, 1909. Ten instalments in as many succeeding issues of the magazine, covering the period of the Civil War (July, 1862–April 22, 1865), were followed in February, 1910, and the eleven subsequent months, by other instalments on the period of Reconstruction (April, 1865–April 17, 1869). Comparison of the *Atlantic* text with the final and greatly extended text now published reveals the anonymous hand of a careful, if not expert, editor bent upon giving the reader as far as possible Mr. Welles's own words. The reader, we are told, "may have full confidence that the text of the diary has been in no way mutilated or revised". It seems fair, accordingly, to assume that no attempt has been made to produce a better piece of literary workmanship than was left by the author.

The opening section, *The Beginnings of the War* (I. 3-69), is an account, prepared by Mr. Welles "several years after the events narrated", of a variety of incidents selected without strict regard to continuity over a period of about a year, the first year of Lincoln's term. Differing in no marked respect from Mr. Welles's customary style, it may have been originally planned as the beginning by Welles of a sketch for a possible history of the Lincoln-Johnson epoch. It serves at any rate as an appropriate precursor to the *Diary* proper.

The *Diary* records, for the most part in a vigorous way, many reflections of men and incidents, and covers a period of about seven years (July, 1862-June 6, 1869). There are 766 pages of comment, inclusive of the impressive and important record of the Lincoln tragedy (II. 280 ff.), on Lincoln's administration. There are 946 pages which throw light on the inside workings of Johnson's troubled term.

On the whole the records under Lincoln afford the most interesting reading. Mr. Welles himself depended on them for most of his *Galaxy* articles. Nicolay obtained a few of the more important of them, occasionally printing exact transcripts where it served his purpose. But it is a matter of large consequence to all students of the war epoch that the Secretary of the Navy's reflections on emancipation, on the beginnings of the policy of reconstruction under Lincoln, and on such figures as McClellan, Halleck, Meade, and Grant, as well as on Seward, Stanton, Chase, and other Cabinet associates, should be accessible for consultation and consideration. These are not history, but they constitute the sort of material out of which the narrative of history is made—colored, vitalized, and strengthened. While Welles leaves Stanton very much as he found him, the most enigmatic and intolerable figure among all the advisers, he had enough appreciation of Seward's ability and virtues to record at many points what would appear to be truthful impressions of him, and so to draw a likeness that cannot be ignored by any future biographer of the Secretary of State. Attention may be directed in this connection to the importance of Welles's detailed record of the Cabinet conference with the Senate committee late in December, 1862 (I. 194 ff.)—one of the most extraordinary incidents in the movement to force Lincoln to dismiss the Secretary of State. This record becomes all the more interesting and significant if compared with Senator Fessenden's contemporary notes on the same incident, written from a different point of view and printed five years ago in Francis Fessenden's *Life and Public Services of William Pitt Fessenden* (Boston, 1907), I. 231-253.

The second portion of the *Diary*, which follows the account of Lincoln's death in Washington, is likely to prove the more valuable contribution to history. Here one gets many discerning impressions of the development and failure of Johnson's ideal of reconstruction, the story of the veto of the Tenure-of-Office bill, comments on the suspension of Stanton, severe reflections on the growing ambition of Grant for political honors, glimpses of Stanbery, Evarts, and Sumner, together with

some of the inside and complicated history of the impeachment process. Above the details of Cabinet discord, Congressional bickerings, and the miserable squabbles of hostile and ill-natured partizans both in and outside Congress, there stands forth in Welles's pages the figure of Andrew Johnson. The portrait is essentially a new one done by a friendly and intelligent hand. It is sufficiently definite too to impel careful students of the man and the peculiarly grave problems which confronted him to reconsider such impressions of him as they may already have gained from other sources. It is not apparently a conscious defense of Johnson, an attempt to rescue his memory from the oblivion which his enemies hoped might overtake it. On the contrary it is drawn incidentally and gradually as the acquaintance and intimacy grew. There is no effort to deny weaknesses: Johnson's persistent reticence with his advisers, his intellectual hesitancy often followed by rash and precipitate decision and action are frequently dwelt upon. What Welles admired and set forth was the evidence of Johnson's loyalty to constitutional principles. He found his state papers often illuminating. Of measures he reckoned him a good judge, but not of men.

Of Welles's own ability as a Cabinet councillor, his alertness to principles, his insight into men, and his industry, the *Diary* affords much evidence. A journalist by training, and for years before 1861 accustomed to keeping a diary, Welles had become habituated to the uncritical use of caustic phrases and characterizations. He could not rid himself of modes of expression that are certainly often misleading and untrue to his deeper and real convictions. The *Diary* might well serve as a challenge to a biographer to try his hand at a portrait of the Secretary of the Navy, for without it such a portrait has been hitherto impossible.

This final text of the *Diary* suggests one very important problem of the "higher criticism". In view of the activity of Mr. Welles as a writer during the last eight years, when he had retired from public life to his Hartford home, did he, it may be asked, revise the original records of this *Diary* or, at any rate in some instances, elaborate them? Two passages, among others, will serve to make the reasonableness of this query evident. (1) No account is taken in the opening section (admittedly written some years after the events narrated) of the Trent Affair. The first important allusion, indeed almost the only one in the *Diary*, to that episode occurs under date of May 12, 1863 (I. 299). There he writes of Wilkes's "strange course in taking Slidell and Mason from the Trent". Seward, he adds, "at first approved the course of Wilkes in capturing Slidell and Mason, and added to my embarrassment in so disposing of the question as not to create discontent by rebuking Wilkes for what the country approved. But when, under British menace, Seward changed his position, he took my position, and the country gave him great credit for what was really my act and the undoubted law of the case." This is so obviously unfair to Seward and out of accord with

Welles's own careful statements that the attention of the unwary reader might have been briefly called to these statements ("The Capture and Release of Mason and Slidell", *Galaxy*, May, 1873, XV. 640 ff.; *Lincoln and Seward*, pp. 184 ff.). (2) The second passage is a long series of reflections on the course of New York party politics with extended comments on the history of the Albany Regency (October 7, 1867, III. 223-229). It is too long to quote. It is the sort of subject in which Mr. Welles had been much interested for a great many years and on which he had often expressed himself in editorials long before he was called into the Cabinet. A careful reading of it will show that it was probably written after Johnson's administration. At any rate it appears to the reviewer to be a passage not likely to have been written under the date given.

Mr. Morse's Introduction gives an excellent sketch, not always quite accurate, of Mr. Welles's life. The index, by Mr. D. M. Matteson, is ample without being exhaustive. A few incidental references to Calhoun (I. 376; III. 52, 223) might have been included. The one serious omission noted in the index is the failure to include any direct reference to Charles Sumner; a page has, at this point, fallen out, but the publishers stand ready to supply it. Otherwise, the book is a carefully printed and sumptuous work.

HENRY BARRETT LEARNED.

The Tariff in Our Times. By IDA M. TARBELL. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1911. Pp. ix, 375.)

AT a time when the perennial tariff question seems to be more prominent than usual this volume, appearing originally as a series of articles in the *American Magazine*, is most opportune, especially as it deals with a phase of the subject which, though of great importance, has never yet received adequate attention. The two leading books previously available covering this general subject were Taussig's *Tariff History of the United States* and Stanwood's *American Tariff Controversies*. The former dealt with the subject primarily from the point of view of economics, studying the economic basis and results of protection; and on that side it still retains the pre-eminently authoritative position it has always held. The latter volume, written with a distinct protectionist bias, was primarily devoted to the political history of the tariff. Though at the same time it discussed to some extent the economic aspects of the question this discussion was unsatisfactory, being superficial, uncritical, and partizan. Miss Tarbell gives her chief attention to still another phase of the problem, one which might well be called the moral history of the tariff. As such it is a distinct and highly desirable addition to the literature of the subject.

The tale begins, as Miss Tarbell takes it up, with that abrupt change in our tariff which came with the Civil War. Under pressure of the